DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 291 772 TM 011 057

AUTHOR Redfield, Doris L.; Craig, James R.
TITLE Identifying and Documenting Student Outcomes for Use in the Evaluation of Teachers When Standardized Achievement Tests Do Not Apply.
PUB DATE 87
NOTE 43p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association (Mobile, AL, November 10-13, 1987).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Achievement; Evaluation Methods; Needs Assessment; *Standardized Tests; *Teacher Effectiveness; Teacher Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS Kentucky Student Achievement Project

ABSTRACT

The Student Achievement Outcome goal setting component of the Student Achievement Project (SAP) is described in this paper. It has focused on implementation and documentation procedures that may serve as alternatives to the exclusive use of standardized achievement test scores as indexes of student achievement and indicators of teacher effectiveness. The SAP is a three- to five-year study designed to address the inclusion of student achievement in Kentucky's educational program. The study involved 26 teachers working in 15 independent and county school districts. Participants developed goals and project synopses and held conferences with their principals before proceeding with implementation of projects. While standardized achievement test scores may be used as indicators of school or district level effectiveness, they cannot yet be defensibly used as measures of individual teacher effectiveness. Nonetheless, the piloted procedures described in this paper have potential for development as part of a teacher evaluation system that includes student achievement outcome data. The Goal/Assessment Documentation Form for Conference 1 and 2 and 16 data tables are appended. (TJH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED291772

Identifying and Documenting Student Outcomes for Use in the Evaluation of Teachers When Standardized Achievement Tests Do Not Apply

Doris L. Redfield* and James R. Craig

Western Kentucky University

Running Head: Identifying and Documenting

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Doris Redfield

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

TM011 057

Presented at the 1987 Annual Meetings of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, Mobile, AL.

---

* Doris L. Redfield is on leave from Western Kentucky University to the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Educational Research and Improvement. This work was supported by Kentucky's Career Ladder Commission. No official support or endorsement by the U.S. Department of Education is intended or should be inferred.

Identifying and Documenting Student Outcomes For Use in the Evaluation of Teachers When Standardized Achievement Tests Do Not Apply

Doris L. Redfield and James R. Craig

Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to describe one component (viz., Student Achievement Outcome goal setting) of a project designed to address the inclusion of student achievement in Kentucky's Career Ladder Plan. That plan calls for the evaluation of a teacher "regarding the achievement of his/her students . . . based on a determination of whether or not the students have been achieving at the expected level" (Report of Kentucky Career Ladder Committee, 1985). A special, separate project on Student Achievement resulted from the Kentucky Career Ladder Commission's realization that the Kentucky Career Ladder Pilot Project planned for 1986-87 could not adequately address the many complex issues surrounding the use of student achievement data in the evaluation of teaching.

The Student Achievement project, then, was proposed as a three- to five-year study of the "defensible" and "fair" use of student outcome data in the evaluation of teaching. Defensible was defined as "reliable and valid"; fair was defined as "without bias", either for or against, a particular individual or group (e.g., student, teacher, administrator). The first year of the proposed project was undertaken during the 1986-87 academic year. The issues resulting in the project are detailed elsewhere (Redfield, 1987; Redfield & Craig, 1987).

Procedures and Results

Participant Recruitment

In September, 1986, independent and county school districts

within 90 minutes driving distance of the project director, who would also function as site coordinator, were identified (n=25). To avoid confounding Kentucky Career Ladder Pilot (KCLP) and Student Achievement data, no district participated in both projects. Since dealing with 25 districts was unmanageable, 15 districts were randomly selected from the 25-district pool. The superintendents and local education association (i.e., Kentucky Education Association) presidents in each of the 15 designated districts were invited, by telephone and follow-up letter, to nominate teachers for participation in the first year of the Student Achievement project. The intent of the pilot was explained. Those contacted were assured that the project activities would not take participating teachers away from their classroom responsibilities and that participating teachers would be compensated for out-of-class time spent on the project. In keeping with the requirements for participation in Steps 3 and 4 of the Kentucky Career Ladder Plan, requirements for nomination to participate in the Student Achievement project included a master's degree and seven years of teaching experience. It was additionally suggested that nominees be both content and student oriented and have the respect of the educational community. Further, it was explained that nominated teachers would be invited, in writing, to submit an application for participation. Teachers from each of several specified categories would be randomly selected to participate. Not one superintendent or Kentucky Education Association representative said, "no" to the invitation to nominate teachers.

The number of teachers nominated was 237. Of those, 112 responded positively, with one condition being availability for the first all-day planning session scheduled for Saturday September 27,

1986. The content areas and grade levels of the 26 selected teachers are presented in Table 1. When more than the predetermined number of teachers was available in any particular grade level by subject matter category, participants were randomly selected. When categories could not be filled, participants were randomly selected regardless of category until the 26 budgeted slots were filled. All selected teachers had seven or more years of teaching experience; 25 of the 26 had master's degrees. The teacher without a master's degree was needed to fill a particular content area slot. Additionally, three available principals (one at each of three levels: elementary, middle, and high school) and two instructional supervisors were asked to work with the group of 26 teachers.

Insert Table 1 about here

Project Planning

On Saturday, September 27, 1986, the selected teachers, three principals, and two instructional supervisors met for a full day with the project coordinator. The purposes of the meeting were to: (a) introduce the group to the problems surrounding the use of student achievement data in the evaluation of teaching, (b) consider potential solutions to the problem, and (c) establish procedures for trying an approach to problem resolution.

The group agreed to try a Student Achievement Outcome goal setting approach to illustrate: (a) the kinds of student outcomes they work toward and (b) how they evaluate the degree to which those outcomes are attained. This approach was chosen because it would accommodate the wide variety of needs of these teachers. Their

teaching assignments ranged from kindergarten to high school calculus; from educable mentally handicapped to gifted; and from basic skills to visual and industrial arts. The Goal Assessment Documentation Forms, shown in the Appendix, guided the discussion of how such an approach might work regardless of grade level, subject matter area, type of student (e.g., special education, gifted) or desired learning outcome (e.g., changed behavior, academic skills, artistic performance). The forms and guidelines were modified by the teachers and used throughout the Student Achievement project.

In order to accomplish their task, project participants: (a) developed a timeline and procedures for meeting the timeline and (b) made three major decisions. First, they decided that each participating teacher would meet three times with his/her evaluating supervisor. In every case the supervisor was a principal or assistant prinicipal. Both the project director and participating teachers emphasized to principals that project participation was not to influence the principal's evaluation of the teacher. The purpose of the first, brief meeting was to give the principal a one page synopsis of the project and make an appointment to meet with the principal after he/she had time to read the synopsis. The synopsis was provided by the project director. The purpose of the second meeting was to negotiate a set of Student Achievement Outcome goals that the participating teacher would work toward and document throughout the project year. The purpose of the third meeting, held near the end of the project year, was to discuss the teacher's documentation showing the degree to which the pre-established goals had been met.

A second decision made by project participants was that each participating teacher would document from four to eight goals. These

goals were not to be conjured up as a result of participating in the Student Achievement project; rather, goals were to be selected from the repertoire of goals that each teacher had already developed or planned to pursue throughout the school year. The importance of not changing what they would ordinarily do was emphasized because an objective of the Student Achievement project is to document what teachers reasonably do to demonstrate their students' achievements, especially when standardized test scores cannot be used.

Participants decided that at least one goal was to be from each of the following categories: (a) specific academic (i.e., desired academic outcomes specific to a subject matter area -- mastery at balancing equations, for example), (b) general academic (i.e., desired academic outcomes cutting across subject matter areas -- correct grammar in written work, for example), (c) specific nonacademic (i.e., desired nonacademic outcomes, such as behaviors and attitudes, specific to the needs of a particular teaching/learning situation) and (d) general nonacademic (i.e., desired nonacademic outcomes, such as positive self-concept, which cut across a variety of teaching/learning situations). Any particular goal could be short-range, mid-range, or long-range in nature. Short-range goals are interum goals to be accomplished during a period of time less than the total period of time a teacher spends with a student, group, or class (e.g., a goal that is to be accomplished by the end of the first quarter of a semester-long class). Mid-range goals are goals slated for accomplishment by the end of the time period a teacher spends with a student, group, or class. Long-range goals are those which are worked toward, but which may not be fully accomplished within the time period a teacher works with a particular student, group, or class

(e.g., responsibility, writing). Goals, then could fit any one of 12 categories: 2 (specific or general) x 2 (academic or nonacademic) x 3 (short-range or mid-range or long-range).

A third major decision made by project participants was that paperwork should be kept to a minimum. Documentation for each goal was limited to one page (e.g., a page of scores, a graph of behavioral observations, etc.). This suggestion was meant to combat the problems experienced by other states when teachers submitted thick portfolios to demonstrate their competence. Sifting relevant information for decision-making purposes from such portfolios has been deemed nearly impossible and eliminated in states such as Tennessee.

Project Implementation

After presenting their principals with a project synopsis and making a conference appointment, participating teachers conferenced with their principals early in October. Throughout October and November, the project director made site visits to each teacher participant to provide assistance, as necessary, and to ensure that plans were being implemented as prescribed.

On January 17, 1987, project participants again met together as a group for a half day. The purposes of the meeting were to: (a) clarify the meaning of the data gathered to date and (b) address the issues and concerns arising out of the project director's site visits to project participants.

Results

Throughout this section it is critical that the reader remember that the teacher participants were asked to document what they would normally do. The intent of this request was to gain insight regarding the array of strategies used by teachers to assess

student outcomes in a wide variety of outcome areas and across a wide variety of student types (e.g., special education, gifted, elementary, secondary, traditional and nontraditional subject matter areas).

How Many Goals Did the Teachers Work Toward and Document? The number of goals documented by each participating teacher ranged from three to six. Most teachers (n=17) opted to document four goals, one from each of the prescribed categories described in the "Project Planning" section of this paper (i.e., specific academic, specific nonacademic, general academic, general nonacademic). Two teachers started the project year with four goals; but, due to circumstances beyond their control (e.g., student of concern moved; illness which kept teacher out of school for an extended period of time), these two teachers completed and documented only three. Five teachers documented five goals and two teachers documented six goals. The total number of goals documented by the 26 participating teachers was 111.

To What Sizes of Student Groups Did the Goals Apply? Various goals pertained to individual students, small groups of students (more than one but fewer than an entire class) an entire class, or multiple classes. Examples of goals aimed at different size (target) groups appear in Table 2. The sizes of groups targeted by the documented goals, the number of teachers targeting each group size, and the number of times any particular teacher targeted a group of a particular size are shown in Table 3.

Insert Tables 2 and 3 about here

What Types of Goals Did Teachers Document? Recall that

project participants decided that at least one goal was to be from each of the following categories: (a) specific academic, (b) general academic, (c) specific nonacademic, and (d) general nonacademic. Any particular goal could be short-range, mid-range, or long-range in scope. Thus, goals could fit any one of 12 categories: 2 (specific or general) x 2 (academic or nonacademic) x 3 (short-range or mid-range or long-range). Examples of the twelve types of goals that teachers documented are in Table 4. The types of goals teachers chose to document, the number/percent of teachers choosing to document each goal type, and the minimum and maximum number of particular goal types documented by individual teachers are shown in Table 5.

Insert Tables 4 and 5 about here

What Influenced the Goals that Teachers Chose to Document?

Participating teachers wrote their own goals in whatever format they wished or would normally use. They did not select goals from a predetermined menu because an intent of the Student Achievement project was to determine what outcomes these teachers wanted for their students. After writing each goal, teachers were asked to reflect upon sources which had influenced their adoption of the goal. As documented in Table 6, the following sources were cited: consultation with colleagues; guidelines (e.g., curriculum, district, professional association, school, state); available methods and materials (e.g., curriculum materials/packages, Kentucky Essential Skills list, prescribed scope and sequence, standardized tests); professional development activities (e.g., coursework, in-service training,

workshops, professional literature); professional judgement (based on experience, observation, past student performance, personal belief, importance to upcoming learning, etc.); and/or a variety of rules and regulations (e.g., district-level, state or federal law, professional ethics, school rules).

Insert Table 6 about here

How Did Teachers and Their Principals Assess the Educational Significance of Each Goal? A concern of the project participants and of educators consulted during the proposal stages of the Student Achievement project was that teachers might be unduly rewarded for accomplishing trivial goals. Hence, an attempt was made to gauge the educational significance of each of the goals documented. This was done by having each participating teacher and his/her principal use a five-point scale to agree on the educational significance of each of the teacher's goals. A rating of five represented highly significant; a rating of one represented insignificant. The mean goal significance ranged from 2.75 - 4.83 across each of the 26 teachers. The grand mean (across all goals and all teachers) was 4.50. Teachers were also asked to provide the project director with a rationale for each rating. Depending on particular principals' involvement in the Student Achievement Outcome goal negotiation process, these rationales may have resulted from the teacher-principal conferences or they may have resulted from the teacher alone. When teachers determined rationales in isolation, they may have done so either before or after conferencing with their principals. Examples of rationales provided for ratings of 5 (highly significant) included: "the skill is basic

to further studies in chemistry," "the student will need to be self-reliant to be successful in college-level work," and "if students do not attend class, they cannot learn." These rationales may later be taken into account if goal ratings are to be callibrated on a larger scale for use with teachers in general.

How Did Teachers and Their Principals Assess the Ease (Difficulty) of Reaching the Goals? A major concern of project participants and educators consulted during the preparation of the project proposal was that the difficulty of attaining any particular goal be taken into account when assessing the degree to which the goal had been met. Therefore, each teacher and his/her principal were asked to agree, using a five-point scale, on the ease (or difficulty) of accomplishing each goal. A rating of 5 represented a very difficult goal; a rating of 1 represented a very easy goal. The mean of goal difficulty ratings for each of the 26 teachers ranged from 3.0 - 4.8. The grand mean was 3.97. Again teachers were asked to provide rationales for each rating. For example, a rating of 4 was assigned because "students are not accustomed to exercising their brains;" a rating of 5 was assigned because "the student has a poor attitude toward school;" a rating of 2 was assigned because "students are eager to learn this -- they asked if they could." These rationales may later be used to guide larger scale callibration efforts.

What Factors Did Teachers and Their Principals Think Would Influence the Teacher's Abilities to Achieve Their Goals? If factors beyond the teacher's control are to be taken into account when attributing student outcomes to teachers, then it becomes important to determine what those factors are. The educational research-based literature (see Bibliography) tells us that innate ability, prior

experience, and socioeconomic factors influence measures of academic achievement. Teachers participating in the Student Achievement project certainly subscribe to the findings reported in the literature. They also cited student behaviors, attitudes, and affects as well as various support systems (e.g., parent/home, colleagial, administrative, budget) as having an influence. Of the "support" citations, home support was by far the most prevalent (12 of 16 citations). A summary of the factors cited as influencing ease/difficulty of goal attainment appears in Table 7.

Insert Table 7 about here

What Types of Information Did Teachers Plan to Use to Document Goal Attainment? Teachers were asked to specify the kind of information they would provide as evidence of the degree to which any particular goal had been achieved. Throughout the project, some of these pre-specified plans necessarily changed. For example, one teacher planned to use evaluations by persons attending a health fair conducted by her students to measure the students' knowledge of the skills she taught them in preparation for the fair. After consultation with project staff it was decided that the students' actual performance of the tasks required for success of the fair (e.g., accurate monitoring of blood pressure) would provide more direct documentation of the desired outcome (i.e., students' ability to apply their knowledge).

Pre-planned forms of documentation included: charts, checklists, contest/competition ratings, course and/or teacher evaluation forms, behavioral observations, attendance records, grades,

referrals, professional reports, and test scores. Most of the tests used were not standardized. A summary of the documentation preplanned by participating teachers is presented in Table 8 and it reflects the repetoire of mechanisms considered by the teachers.

Insert Table 8 about here

How Did Teachers and Their Principals Assess the Relationship Between the Teachers' Goals and Proposed Documentation? A particularly difficult task was defining goals in such a way that their outcomes could be documented or measured. Thus, teachers, along with their principals, were asked to assess the relationship between each of their goals and the documentation proposed for demonstrating the degree of goal realization. This assessment was made using a five-point scale with 5 representing a superior relationship and 1 representing a poor relationship. The mean rating for relationship for individual teachers ranged from 3.25 - 5.0. The grand mean, across all teachers and goals was 4.34. Teachers were asked to provide a rationale for each rating for possible future use. An example of a rationale for a rating of 5 was "the outcome is easy to see -- either the students pronounce the words correctly or they don't;" an example of a rationale for a rating of 3 was "documentation is too subjective."

When Did Teachers Gather Their Documentation Data? The nature of particular goals often determined the optimal or most efficient time for collecting evidence of progress or goal attainment. For example, mid-range academic goals might be efficiently monitored via pretesting at the beginning of a semester or

year and posttesting at the end of a semester or year. However, the monitoring of progress toward specific objectives necessary for meeting the mid-range goal may require monitoring at the end of each instructional unit. When modifying behaviors, it is tempting to cease monitoring once the behavior is acceptable; however, from an evaluation standpoint, it is critical that the changed behavior be maintained over time. Teachers varied greatly in their specification of times for collecting documentation data; these variations seem warranted in light of their different goals. Examples of the data collection schedules adopted by the teachers include: as necessary; beginning and/or throughout and/or ending of a week, month, unit, semester, etc.; each class, day, week, month, etc.; and/or after a specific event, (e.g., after a test).

The data concerning schedules for collection of documentation data are summarized in Table 9.

Insert Table 9 about here

How Did Teachers Assign Meaning to their Documentation Data?

If documentation of goal progress is to be assessed, the data must be in interpretable form. For example, it is difficult to defensibly interpret the meaning of a notebook containing a student's writing assignments. It is relatively easy to defensibly interpret the meaning of a list of scores representing a student's performance on each of those same writing assignments when the criteria for scoring are clearly specified. A task of teachers participating in the Student Achievement project was to specify how they assigned meaning to the data collected for documentation purposes. The techniques they

used, as summarized in Table 10, included: average (mean) values; categorical ratings (e.g., excellent vs. good vs. average vs. fair vs. unacceptable; complete vs. incomplete vs. not attempted); certificates representing accomplishment; worksamples; frequency counts; grades; letters/abbreviations (e.g., Ex for excused, T for tardy, P for partial mastery); proportions; points; scores; stickers representing compliance; symbols (e.g., checkmarks, Xs, + signs, - signs); tallies; and notes or anecdotal records.

Insert Table 10 about here

How Did Teachers Try to Make Their Documentation Fair to Students? A major concern is that any evaluation be fair or unbiased, either positively or negatively, toward students and teachers. Here, teachers were asked to describe what efforts they made to ensure that the evaluation procedures they used were fair to their students. This procedure was included because documentation that may make a teacher look good (e.g., high test scores) might be bad for students (e.g., an easy test for which students had to learn little or nothing). The teachers' responses to the question stated above, are summarized in Table 11 and included: allowing adequate time for students to learn material and prepare for exams; protecting student anonymity (e.g., by not reading their names before grading assignments, omitting names from class records of scores); averaging of several scores obtained at various times rather than depending on one score to represent overall achievement; providing clear instructions and expressions of expectations; treating all students in the same way; randomly selecting data collection times; preplanning/ announcing data

collection times; providing students with feedback regarding their progress; predetermining/announcing grading criteria; providing for independent (external) evaluation; providing instruction at levels appropriate to students' abilities and prior experience; providing for individual differences (instructional and assessment, e.g., administering oral tests to nonreaders); rewarding positive behavior; allowing students to evaluate the class/teacher; and using assessment techniques deemed valid for the purpose at hand.

Insert Table 11 about here

What Criteria Were Used to Assess The Degree to Which Goals Were Achieved? To evaluate the degree to which each goal had been attained, it was necessary to determine what level of performance would constitute expected progress. Regardless of the various criterion measures, levels of expectation differed from teacher to teacher and from goal to goal according to any given situation. The criteria stated by teachers were in terms of: designated amounts of change in performance from one point in time to another; competetitive acceptance rates (e.g., in art shows); levels of conformance or compliance; grades (of various kinds), including points, proportions, and letter grades; infractions; mastery; participation; and number or proportion of students passing any given hurdle. The terms in which criteria for progress were defined are summarized in Table 12.

Insert Table 12 about here

What Was the Nature of the Discussions Between Teachers and Their Principals During Negotiation of Student Outcome Goals? In general, teachers reported that little discussion took place. Any discussion that did occur primarily centered on clarification and explanation of the teacher's intent and/or the prinicpal's concern with student safety and/or the subjectivity of some evaluation strategies. In one instance, the principal questioned the educational significance of a proposed goal (being prepared for class); in another instance a principal told a teacher how to obtain helpful information. In general, the data suggest that principals were supportive but not particularly involved. Little evidence of actual negotiation was provided. For the most part, it appears that teachers presented their plans and their principals agreed with them.

How Did Teachers and Their Principals Rate the Teachers' Progress? In late April or early May, 1987, each participating teacher met with his/her principal to reach agreement on the degree to which each of the teacher's goals had been met. A five-point scale, ranging from 5 (representing significant progress) to 1 (represneting no progress), was used to assign the ratings. The mean ratings for individual teachers across goals ranged from 2.0 to 5.0. The grand mean across all teachers for all goals was 3.56. The rationales provided by teachers for the assigned ratings are summarized in Table 13. In addition to the tabled data, it is noteworthy that 18 of the 26 teachers described or provided an anecdotal account of the outcomes associated with their efforts. See Table 14 for several examples.

Insert Tables 13 and 14 about here

What Was the Nature of the Discussions Between Teachers and Their Principals During the End-of-Year Conference? As with the initial conference, the end-of-year conference seemed to generate little discussion or negotiation. In fact, six teachers reported that "no discussion" occurred. When discussion did occur, it primarily centered around: the nature of the intervention that resulted in the degree of goal attainment and/or (b) student outcomes (planned and incidental). The second most frequent source of discussion was the rating assigned to "progress toward goal attainment" and the reasons for that rating.

What Sorts of Documentation Were Actually Submitted? The types of documentation submitted are summarized in Table 15. Regardless of the type of documentation submitted, that documentation assumed a variety of formats. The formats, as summarized in Table 16, included: narration, appropriately marked calendar pages (showing the dates on which particular events occured), gradebook pages (usually with students' names removed), lists, histograms and other graphs, tables and other charts, and/or checklists (none of which were Kentucky Essential Skills Lists).

Insert Tables 15 and 16 about here

How Much Documentation per Goal was REALLY submitted? Recall that Student Achievement project participants decided in September, 1986, that documentation per Student Achievement Outcome goal should be limited to a page. Teachers were able to do so for 63 of their 111 goals. Documentation in excess of a page usually included work samples or information on multiple classes.

Were the Submitted Data Summarized for Ready Interpretation? Data for 74 of the 111 goals, representative of 22 teachers, were summarized. Summaries included such things as measures of central tendency (e.g., a mean) for a list of scores or a sum for a row of checkmarks.

Were the Submitted Data Accurate? Accuracy of computations were checked. Of the summarized data (n=74 goals) the data were accurately summarized for 73. However, the accuracy of the raw data cannot be checked. A check for the accuracy of narrative, anecdotal, etc. data was not possible.

Summary

The component of the Student Achievement project described in this paper has focused on implementation and documentation procedures that may serve as alternatives to the exclusive use of standardized achievement test scores as indexes of student achievement and indicators of teacher effectiveness. While standardized achievement test scores may be used as one indicator of school or district level effectiveness, they cannot yet be defensibly used as measures of individual teacher effectiveness. Nonetheless, the piloted procedures described in this paper have potential for development as part of a teacher evaluation system which includes student achievement outcome data.

References

Redfield, D.L. (1987, November). Expected student achievement as a potential factor for assessing teacher effectiveness. In R.S. Pankratz (Symposium Organizer), The Assessment of Teacher Performance Using Classrom Observations, Structured Interviews, Goal Attainment and Expected Achievement: Lessons Learned. Mid-South Educational Research Association, Mobile, AL.

Redfield, D.L., & Craig, J.R., (1987, October). The use of pupil outcome measures in the assessment of teaching when reliance upon standardized test scores is not defensible. In D.L. Redfield (Panel Organizer), Perspectives on the Use of Student Achievement Data in the Evaluation of Teaching. American Evaluation Association, Boston, MA.

Report of Kentucky Career Ladder Committee (1985). Available from Kentucky Career Ladder Commission, Frankfort, KY.

APPENDIX

GOAL/ASSESSMENT DOCUMENTATION FORM (Conference # 1)

1. Teacher:
2. Target Class(es)/group(s):
3. Number of targeted students:
4. Type of goal (check all that apply):

   _____ specific _____ academic _____ short-range

   _____ general _____ nonacademic _____ mid-range

   _____ long-range
5. Goal statement:

6. Source of goal (check all that apply):

   _____ essential skills list _____ textbook scope & sequence

   _____ state curriculum guide _____ professional literature

   _____ professional association guidelines _____ personal belief

   _____ coursework _____ other (specify): _____

   _____

*7. Educational Significance of the goal (circle one):

1	2	3	4	5
insignificant				highly significant

*8. Ease of goal attainment (circle one):

1	2	3	4	5
very easy				very difficult

*9. Factors influencing the ease of goal attainment (check all that apply):

   _____ socioeconomic status _____ ability

   _____ other (specify): _____

   _____

10. What information will be gathered to document the degree to which this goal is achieved?

*11. The relationship between the goal and the proposed documentation is (check one):

1	2	3	4	5
poor				superior

12. When will the documenting information be gathered?

13. How will weight(s) be assigned to the documenting information?

14. What steps will be taken to enhance the fairness and defensibility of the information gathered and the weights assigned to it?

15. The values assigned to the gathered information will be interpretted as follows:

no progress toward the goal = _____

less than expected progress = _____

expected progress = _____

progress slightly exceeded expectations = _____

progress significantly exceeded expectations = _____

_____ = _____

_____ = _____

16. Date of Principal Conference #1:

17.

Points of discussion/ disagreement	Nature of discussion/ disagreement	Outcome of discussion/ disagreement

18. Notes:

Appendix Continued

GOAL/ASSESSMENT DOCUMENTATION FORM (Conference #2)

*1. Based upon the documenting information gathered, the weight(s) assigned to it, and the interpretation of those weights, progress toward the goal may best be described as follows (circle one):

1	2	3	4	5
no progress				significant progress

2. Date of Principal Conference #2:_____

3.

Points of discussion/ disagreement	Nature of discussion/ disagreement	Outcome of discussion/ disagreement

4. Notes:

Table 1

ESA Teacher Participants by Grade Level and Subject Matter Area

Primary Teachers (grades K-4)	Intermediate Grade Teachers (grades 5-8)	Secondary Teachers (grades 9-12)	Other
Self-Contained kindergarten	Language Arts (2 teachers)	Visual Arts (2 teachers)	Chapter I Reading & Math
*Self-Contained Kindergarten & Gifted Language Arts	*Language Arts and Gifted Language Arts	Science (2 teachers)	Chapter I Reading
Self-Contained 2nd Grade		Language Arts	Chapter I Math
Self-Contained 4th Grade		Math	High School Special Education
Physical Education		Social Sciences	
		*Physical Education & Social Science	
		*Physical Education & Language Arts	
		*Math and Coaching	
		Business Education	
		*Industrial Arts & Coaching	
		*Advanced Math & Physics	
		*Science and Physical Education	

* teacher fits more than one category and is listed in column describing the primary teaching responsibility.

Table 2

Examples of Goals Aimed at Different Size Target Groups

Size of Target Group	Example
Individual Student	"Positively affect student's behavior and peer acceptance."
	"Positively affect the student's skill level in drafting to raise his grade to 75% (C)."
	"Improvement in personal grooming as shown by clean hair, clothing, teeth, and skin (and lack of body odor)."
Small Group	"To promote positive attitudes in three retained eight graders."
	"To improve upper arm strength of the beginning level girls in gymnastics."
	"Lessons will be planned and implemented by the teacher and the Parental Involvement Aide for instruction in the homes of twelve kindergarten children who qualify for program assistance."
Entire Class	"Students will predict valence from the periodic table."
	"Students will develop note-taking skills."
	"Improve students' attitudes about doing their schoolwork. 26 of the 32 students in the class have previously failed classes."
Multiple Classes	"Modify student behavior for safety in lab by their using protective goggles."
	"To instill confidence in speaking before a group (as evidenced by more Superior ratings in Speech Contests)."
	"Each student in the Freshman class understands the basic skills and rules of volleyball."

Table 3

Sizes of Student Groups Targeted by Goals

Size of Group	Number of Goals Applying to group size	Number of Teachers having goals applying to group	Range for individual teachers
Individual Student	32 (29% of all goals)	17 (65% of participating teachers)	0 - 5*
Small Group	15 (14%)	10 (38%)	0 - 2
Entire Class	44 (40%)	20 (77%)	0 - 4
Multiple Classes	19 (17%)	11 (42%)	0 - 3

Note: Total goals do not sum to 111 due to missing or noncategorizable data

* Teacher having 5 Individual Student Goals is a Special Education Teacher

** Small Group = more than one student but fewer than an entire class

Table 4

Examples of Different Types of Goals

Types of Goal	Examples
Specific (S), Academic (A), Short-range (SR)	"All third grade students will learn to forward roll."
	"The student will be able to identify 90% of the major parts of a 3-horse-power Briggs and Stratton engine."
S,A, Mid-range (MR)	"All students in the class who decide to use the English Advanced Placement (A.P.) tesst will make a score of 3 or above."
	"All second graders will know the addition and subtraction facts."
S,A, Long-range (LR)	"Determine why my students, who are a cross section of high school students, achieve and excell to a higher degree than the average public school art student, and how I might yet improve their program for a still higher quality."
S, nonacademic (N), SR	"Students will be able to tie their shoes 100% of the time when asked to do so."
	"To increase the efficiency and thoroughness of cleaning the lab after dissection."
S,N,MR	"To influence Junior Advanced Math students to continue with their math studies and take calculus during their senior year."
	"To encourage students to the Advanced Placement (A.P.) test."
S,N,LR	"Positively affect the student's ability for self-control in conversation and entrance into class."
General (G), A,SR	"Help students improve their speech patterns by eliminating such expressions as 'is you,' 'he do,' and 'ain't.'
G,A,MR	"To improve student's writing skills."

Table 4 Continued

	"The students in two Chemistry I sections will demonstrate adequate retention of class material for an extended period of time. (90% will pass the final exam)."
G,A,LR	"To promote higher levels of thinking (application, analysis, syntheses, evaluation).
	"Student will improve test-taking skills (proofread answers, slow down, decrease level of anxiety) to level of passing in regular, 'mainstream' health and geography classes."
G,N,SR	"Ninth grade students will be in their seats and ready to begin class when the bell rings."
	"To encourage two particular students to turn their essays in on time."
G,N,MR	"Affect a positive change in student preparedness (i.e., on time, materials in hand)."
	"Help improve a particular student's self-concept so that he will want to stay out of in-school suspension this school year."
G,N,LR	"To encourage an habitual absentee to stay in school."
	"To help students exercise self-reliance in working independently."

Table 5

Goal Types Documented by Teachers

Goal Type	Number (%) of Total Goals	Number (%) of teachers selecting Goal Type	Range for Individual Teachers
Specific(S), Academic (A), Short-Range (SR)	9 (8%)	8 (31%)	0 - 2
S, A, Mid-range (MR)	32 (29%)	20 (77%)	0 - 3
S, A, Long-range (LR)	1 (<1%)	1 (4%)	0 - 1
S, Nonacademic (N), SR	3 (3%)	3 (12%)	0 - 1
S, N, MR	9 (8%)	7 (27%)	0 - 2
S, N, LR	2 (2%)	2 (8%)	0 - 1
General (G), A, SR	4 (4%)	4 (15%)	0 - 1
G, A, MR	10 (9%)	9 (35%)	0 - 2
G, A, LR	6 (5%)	6 (23%)	0 - 1
G, N, SR	6 (5%)	6 (23%)	0 - 1
G, N, MR	13 (18%)	13 (50%)	0 - 1
G, N, LR	16 (14%)	12 (46%)	0 - 2

Table 6

Sources Influencing Goal Adoption

Sources Influencing Goal Adoption	Number (%) of Goals Reflecting Source*	Number (%) of Teachers Citing Source	Range of Citation for Individual Teachers
Consultation	2 (2%)	2 (8%)	0 - 1
Guidelines	27 (24%)	18 (69%)	0 - 3
Methods/ Material	48 (43%)	24 (92%)	0 - 3
Professional Development Activities	74 (67%)	26 (100%)	1 - 6
Professional Judgment	74 (67%)	25 (96%)	0 - 4
Rules/ Requirements	4 (4%)	3 (12%)	0 - 2

* Goals may be influenced by more than one source

Table 7

Factors Influencing Ease/Difficulty of Goal Attainment

Factor	Number (%) of Goals Affected by Factor*	Number (%) of Teachers Citing Factor	Range of Citations for Individual Teachers
Students' Abilities	56 (50%)	20 (77%)	0 - 6
Students' Opportunities/ Experience	10 (9%)	6 (23%)	0 - 3
Classroom Conditions	1 (<1%)	1 (4%)	0 - 1
Students' Psychosocial/ Behavioral Characteristics	25 (23%)	14 (54%)	0 - 3
Socioeconomic Status (SEC) of Students' Family	27 (24%)	15 (58%)	0 - 4
Support (from students' families, administrators, colleagues, budgetary)	16 (14%)**	11 (42%)	0 - 4

* More than one factor may influence goal attainment

** 12 of the 16 cited "home support"

Table 8

Planned Documentation of Goal Attainment

Type of Documentation	Number (%) Goals to be Documented	Number (%) Teachers citing Documentation type	Range of Citations for Individual teachers
Charts	2 (2%)	2 (8%)	0 - 1
Checklists	7 (6%)	5 (19%)	0 - 2
Performance Ratings	2 (2%)	2 (8%)	0 - 1
Evaluation Forms	4 (4%)	3 (12%)	0 - 2
Records of Observations	31 (28%)	19 (73%)	0 - 3
Attendance Records	7 (6%)	6 (23%)	0 - 2
Task Completion	10 (9%)	8 (31%)	0 - 2
Records of Demerits/ Infractions	8 (72%)	8 (31%)	0 - 1
Records of Merits (Compliance)	1 (<1%)	1 (4%)	0 - 1
Grades	12 (11%)	8 (31%)	0 - 3
Timely Turn-in of Assignments	3 (3%)	3 (12%)	0 - 1
Referrals	1 (1<%)	1 (4%)	0 - 1
Professional Reports	1 (<1%)	1 (4%)	0 - 1
Standardized Test Scores	11 (10%)	8 (31%)	0 - 3
Other Test Scores	35 (32%)	22 (85%)	0 - 3

Table 9

Documentation Schedules

Type of Schedule	Number (%) of Pertinent Goals	Number (%) of Teachers Citing Schedule Type	Range of Citations for Individual Teachers
As Necessary	2 (2%)	2 (8%)	0 - 1
Beginning and End of Grading Period	1 (<1%)	1 (4%)	0 - 1
Middle and End of Grading Period	1 (<1%)	1 (4%)	0 - 1
End of Grading Period	9 (8%)	7 (27%)	0 - 3
Beginning of Month	2 (2%)	2 (8%)	0 - 1
End of Month	1 (<1%)	1 (4%)	0 - 1
Beginning of Project	1 (<1%)*	1 (4%)	0 - 1
Beginning and Middle of Project	1 (<1%)*	1 (4%)	0 - 1
Beginning and End of Project	3 (3%)	2 (8%)	0 - 2
Beginning, Middle, and End of Project	3 (3%)	3 (12%)	0 - 1
End of Project	1 (<1%)	1 (4%)	0 - 1
Beginning and Middle of Semester	1 (<1%)**	1 (4%)	0 - 1
End of Semester	3 (3%)	3 (12%)	0 - 1
Beginning of Unit	1 (<1%)*	1 (4%)	0 - 1

Table 9 Continued

Type of Schedule	Number (%) of Pertinent Goals	Number (%) of Teachers Citing Schedule Type	Range of Citations for Individual Teachers
Beginning and End of Unit	6 (5%)	6 (23%)	0 - 1
Beginning, Middle, and End of Unit	1 (<1%)	1 (4%)	0 - 1
End of Unit	10 (9%)	9 (35%)	0 - 2
End of Week	1 (<1%)	1 (4%)	0 - 1
Beginning of Year	1 (<1%)*	1 (4%)	0 - 1
Beginning and End of Year	3 (3%)	3 (12%)	0 - 1
Beginning, Middle, and End of Year	3 (3%)	3 (12%)	0 - 1
End of Year	5 (5%)	4 (15%)	0 - 2
Throughout Specified Period	39 (35%)	20 (77%)	0 - 4
Each Specified Unit of Time	19 (17%)	11 (42%)	0 - 3
A Specific, designated time or date	6 (5%)	4 (15%)	0 - 2
Randomly Selected Times	3 (3%)	2 (8%)	0 - 2

Note: The Same Teacher may adhere to different schedules for different goals.

* Documentation throughout a time period (e.g., 20 minutes each day at the beginning of a project)

** Eight week class starting at the beginning, and ending at the middle of a semester

Table 10

Assignment of Meaning to Documentation Data

Representation of Meaning	*Number (%) of goals represented	Number (%) of teachers using representation	Range of Citations for Individual Teachers
Average Value	1 (<1%)	1 (4%)	0 - 1
Categorical Ratings	7 (6%)	7 (27%)	0 - 1
Certificates	1 (<1%)	1 (4%)	0 - 1
Work Samples	4 (4%)	3 (12%)	0 - 2
Frequency Counts	21 (19%)	15 (58%)	0 - 3
Notes and Anecdodes	9 (8%)	8 (31%)	0 - 2
Grades	15 (14%)	8 (31%)	0 - 4
Letter/Abbreviations	8 (7%)	4 (15%)	0 - 4
Proportion	33 (30%)	15 (58%)	0 - 4
Points	3 (3%)	3 (12%)	0 - 1
Scores	6 (5%)	4 (15%)	0 - 2
Stickers	4 (4%)	3 (12%)	0 - 2
Symbols	17 (15%)	13 (50%)	0 - 2
Tallies	5 (5%)	4 (15%)	0 - 2

* More than one representation of meaning was assigned to some documenting data (e.g., checkmarks to show individual students mastery and proportion to represent level of class mastery)

Table 11

Strategies Used By Teachers to Ensure Fairness

Strategy	*Number (%) of goals to which strategy applied	Number (%) of Teachers Using Strategy	Range of Citations for Individual Teacher
Adequate Time Allowed	7 (6%)	5 (19%)	0 - 2
Student Anonymity Protected	5 (5%)	3 (12%)	0 - 3
Average of Multiple Data Points Used	1 (<1%)**	1 (4%)	0 - 1
Clear Instructions/ Expectations	3 (3%)	2 (8%)	0 - 2
Equal/Uniform Treatment of Students	26 (23%)	14 (54%)	0 - 4
Preplanned/ Announced Evaluation Points	14 (13%)	5 (19%)	0 - 5
Preplanned/ Announced Grading Criteria	6 (5%)	4 (15%)	0 - 2
Independent (External) Evaluation	9 (8%)	5 (19%)	0 - 2
Instruction at Appropriate Ability/experience level	5 (5%)	4 (15%)	0 - 2
***Options Provided for meeting task Requirements	1 (<1%)	1 (4%)	0 - 1
Provide for Individual Differences	12 (11%)	6 (23%)	0 - 3

Table 11 Continued

Strategy	*Number (%) of goals to which strategy applied	Number (%) of Teachers Using Strategy	Range of Citations for Individual Teacher
Randomly Determined Data Collection Times	16 (14%)	9 (35%)	0 - 4
Reward Positive Behavior	2 (2%)	2 (8%)	0 - 1
Students Evaluate Teacher/Class	1 (<1%)	1 (4%)	0 - 1
Teacher deems Assessment Technique Valid for Purpose at Hand	41 (37%)	21 (81%)	0 - 3

* More than one strategy may apply to any particular goal

** Used multiple writing samples to assign a weekly writing grade

*** Other teachers considered "options" as providing for individual differences

Table 12

Terms by Which Criteria for Progress Stated

Criteria	Number (%) of Goals to be Assessed According to Criterion	Number (%) of Teachers Stating Criterion in Terms	Range of Citations by Individual Teachers
Change (specified number, proportion, level)	35 (32%)	20 (77%)	0 - 3
Acceptance Rate (Contests, Displaying, Shows)	2 (2%)	2 (8%)	0 - 1
Conformance/ Compliance (Specified number, proportion, level)	14 (13%)	8 (31%)	0 - 3
Grades (points, proportions, letter grades)	8 (7%)	5 (19%)	0 - 2
Infractions (Specified number, proportion, level)	3 (3%)	3 (12%)	0 - 1
Mastery (Specified number of Students reaching, percent or level constituting)	23 (21%)	12 (46%)	0 - 3
Participation	3 (3%)	3 (12%)	0 - 1
Passing (Number or percent of Students passing, criterion for passing)	8 (7%)	4 (15%)	0 - 3

Table 13

Rationales for Progress Ratings*

Rationale	Number (%) of Goal Ratings Rationale applied to	Number (%) of Teachers Using Rationale	Range of Citations for Individual Teachers
Amount of Progress (Change compared to a criterion)	35 (32%)	16 (62%)	0 - 5
Relationship Between Prestated Criteria for Expectation and observed outcome	59 (53%)	18 (69%)	0 - 5
The Pre-established Criteria for expectation were inappropriate	6 (5%)	6 (23%)	0 - 1
The Goal was inappropriate	6 (5%)	6 (23%)	0 - 1
Reasoned Judgement	21 (19%)	12 (46%)	0 - 4
Subject Judgement	7 (6%)	4 (15%)	0 - 3
Observations	6 (5%)	6 (23%)	0 - 1
Documentation Not Available (e.g., Advanced Placement Test Scores)	7 (6%)	6 (23%)	0 - 2
Uncontrollable factors (e.g., illness, ability, heritage)	12 (11%)	8 (31%)	0 - 3

* More than one rationale may apply to a rating

Table 14

Examples of Outcome Descriptions and Anecdotes

"Each class must be told to wear goggles at every lab -- all the students don't comply otherwise."

"We went beyond our goal (for expected progress) but I thought the students could have gone beyond what they did."

"I was somewhat disappointed that only one student reached the 100% goal. However, basically I was pleased with their progress as a group especially as two out of the group are very low functional readers and they all reached over 90% accuracy."

"_____ has turned in much neater work over the last quarter. He seems to take more time."

"_____ now takes his test with almost no prompting to slow down and with very minimal help with reading. However, he still prefers not to take his test in the regular classroom."

"Even though the number of office referrals was reduced, the majority of the students made a score of 70 or lower on the posttest."

"The student has shown interest in participating in class. He seems to think deeper and offer more responses than before our conference."

"Results taken from classroom chart show 79% more merits than demerits. I expected at least 80% more merits. I felt that I had set my expectancy level too high. Principal feels other factors involved."

"Because of their interest in a second language, the students were very receptive to the new vocabulary words. Because of time (lack of) only 28 words were introduced."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 15

Types of Documentation Acutally Submitted

Type of Documentation	Number (%) Pertinent Goals	Number (%) of Teachers Selecting Documentation Type	Range of Citations for Individual Teachers
*Anecdotal	33 (30%)	15 (58%)	0 - 5
Proportions	23 (21%)	12 (46%)	0 - 3
Symbols	12 (11%)	8 (31%)	0 - 2
Scores (other than standardized test scores)	19 (17%)	12 (46%)	0 - 3
**Work-Samples	4 (4%)	4 (15%)	0 - 1
Grades	4 (4%)	3 (12%)	0 - 2
***Standardized Test Scores	6 (5%)	2 (8%)	0 - 3
Office Records	1 (<1%)	1 (4%)	0 - 1

* Eight teachers representing 17 goals relied exclusively upon anecdotal records; the remaining seven teachers representing 16 goals additionally used other forms of documentations.

** Only two of these teachers relied exclusively upon worksamples as documentation.

*** Only two of these goals, both stemming from the same teacher, were exclusively reliant upon standardized test scores for documentation.

Table 16

Formats Assigned by Submitted Documentation

Format	Number (%) of Goals Documented Using Format	Number (%) of Teachers Using Format	Range of Citations by Individual Teachers
*Narrative	55 (50%)	21 (81%)	0 - 4
Marked Calender Page(s)	2 (2%)	2 (8%)	0 - 1
Grade-book page(s)	20 (18%)	10 (38%)	0 - 3
List	13 (12%)	8 (31%)	0 - 3
Graphs/Histrograms	18 (16%)	8 (31%)	0 - 5
Tables/Charts	24 (22%)	14 (54%)	0 - 4
Checklists	11 (10%)	6 (23%)	0 - 3

* Twenty-two goals represented by ten teachers had narration as the exclusive form of documentation. However, most narratives provided a data based summary.